REMARKS

Introduction

In the Office Action of January 24, 2005, the Abstract of the disclosure was objected to

as containing claim language, i.e., the word "means." Appropriate corrections have been made.

also in the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being

anticipated by Miyake et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,515,354. Claims 11, 13 and 15 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Oudenhuysen et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,789,977. In addition,

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Miyake et al. in view of Horinouchi

et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,377,177. Further, Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) over Miyake et al. in view of Horinouchi et al., further in view of Braat, U.S. Patent

No. 4,986,641. Additionally, Claims 12, 14, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over

Oudenhuysen et al.

The claims have been amended into patentable form.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the direction changing means comprises a

triangular prism that has an incident surface, a reflecting surface, and an emitting surface.

Claim 1 also has been revised to specify that the hologram is formed on the emitting surface of

the triangular prism. This structure is not disclosed in Miyake et al. Rather, Miyake et al.

utilizes a plate-shaped hologram mirror 12. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Miyake

et al.

Moreover, applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 as amended is not suggested by the

cited references. In this regard, the Examiner has stated it would be obvious to substitute the

polygon 101 of Horinouchi et al. for the hologram mirror 12 of Miyake et al. Applicant does not

agree with this conclusion. An essential goal of Miyake et al. is to provide a hologram mirror

that occupies a minimum distance orthogonal to disc 10. In this regard, Miyake et al. points out

-6-

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC

1420 Fifth Avenue Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101

that the disclosed hologram mirror takes up far less distance in the direction orthogonal to the

disk than would a mirror that is tilted at 45 degrees. See Col. 6, lines 24-27 of Miyake et al. In

Miyake et al., the hologram mirror 12 is tilted at an angle of approximately 18 degrees relative to

the plane of the disk 12. Consequently, Miyake et al. would not be interested in replacing this

hologram mirror 12 with a much larger polygon prism 101 of Horinouchi et al., especially since

doing so would be contrary to the objective sought to be reached by Miyake.

Moreover, if the hologram mirror of Miyake et al. were replaced with polygon prism 101

of Horinouchi et al., the objective lens 11 of Miyake et al. would be superfluous. For this

additional reason, it would not be obvious to combine Horinouchi et al. and Miyake et al. in a

manner suggested by the Examiner.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 as amended is now

allowable over the cited art. Further, Claims 2 and 5-10 depend directly or indirectly from

Claim 1, and thus also should now be found allowable.

Claim 11 has been amended to specify that the direction changing means comprises a

substantially planar beam splitter. In Oudenhuysen, the direction changing means is in the form

of a triangular prism. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 as amended is

not fully disclosed by Oudenhuysen.

Moreover, applicant submits that Claim 11 as amended is not rendered obvious by the

cited art. In this regard, applicant notes that a primary objective of Miyake is to incorporate

hologram 13a into the hologram mirror 12. Claim 11, as amended, on the other hand, specifies a

hologram unit disposed in front of the direction changing means. Accordingly, applicant

-7-

respectfully submits that Claim 11 as amended should be deemed allowable.

In addition, because Claims 12, 15, and 16 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 11,

these sub-claims also should now be found allowable.

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLE 1420 Fifth Avenue

1420 Fifth Avenue Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101

206.682.8100

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the pending claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the foregoing, she is requested to contact the undersigned at 206-695-1705.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC

Jerald E. Nagae

Direct/Dial No. 206.695.1705

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date:

te: (June 23, 2005

JEN:ejh